

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 2-13, 15-26, 28, and 29 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 14, and 27 are canceled. Claims 2-4, 7-13, 15-17, 20-26, 28, and 29 are amended. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants do not concede that the originally filed claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are included only to facilitate expeditious prosecution. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Asserted Anticipation

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 7, 9-11, 14, 20, 22-24, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by *Stern*, System and Method for Automated Annotation of Files, U.S. Patent 6,572,661 (June 3, 2003) (hereinafter “*Stern*”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

This rejection is in error. Therefore, Applicants reserve the right to present these claims in a continuation application.

However, to facilitate expeditious prosecution in this case, Applicants have canceled independent claims 1, 14, and 27 and instead placed the features of these claims into dependent claims 2, 15, and 28. The Examiner indicates that dependent claim 2 is allowable over the cited art. Claims 15 and 28 contain features similar to those presented in claim 2; therefore, claims 15 and 28 also should be allowable. The remaining dependent claims have been amended to depend from one of claims 2, 15, and 28. Accordingly, all pending claims should now be in condition for allowance.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Asserted Obviousness

The Examiner rejected claims 3-6, 8, 12, 13, 16-20, 21, 25, 26, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious in view of *Stern* and one or more of a variety of other references, including *Ballback* (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0032095), *Shupak* (U.S. Patent 6,874,140), *Charisus* (U.S. Patent 6,983,446), *Kay* (U.S. Patent 6,021,266), and *Ben-Romdhane* (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0031015).

All of these rejections are in error. Therefore, Applicants reserve the right to present these claims in a continuation application.

However, to facilitate expeditious prosecution in this case, Applicants have canceled independent claims 1, 14, and 27 and instead placed the features of these claims into dependent claims 2, 15, and 28. The Examiner indicates that dependent claim 2 is allowable over the cited art. Claims 15 and 28 contain

features similar to those presented in claim 2; therefore, claims 15 and 28 also should be allowable. The remaining dependent claims have been amended to depend from one of claims 2, 15, and 28.

Accordingly, all pending claims should now be in condition for allowance.

III. Objection to Claims

The Examiner stated that claim 2 is allowable. Claims 15 and 28 contain features that are nearly identical to those presented in claim 2. Additionally, all of the claims now contain the features presented in claim 2. Therefore, the application should now be in condition for allowance.

IV. Conclusion

The subject application is patentable over the cited references and should now be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: September 5, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Theodore D. Fay III/

Theodore D. Fay III
Reg. No. 48,504
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants